

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

In the original filing FIG. 11 was omitted. FIG. 11 is attached hereto. FIG. 11 represents part of an Internet draft where the present invention may be advantageously employed. See original application page 56 lines 13-15. FIG. 11 does not support any elements of any claims in the present invention.

### REMARKS

As stated above, FIG. 11 was missing from the original application filing. But, FIG. 11 does not support any claim, it only completes an Internet draft where the present invention may find use. So, acceptance should not affect any change in the date of filing.

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action of 1/12/2006. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-27 are in the case, no new claims are added.

Claims 9, 16, 25 and 27 are amended herein to include the limitation of forming two tags for directing a packet.

Representative wording found in claim 9 follows:

adding **a first forwarding tag based on an egress router associated with said destination address and a second tag that identifies the channel associated with the destination address, and forwarding said data packet to another provider router; and**

...

...

iii. if said data packet is next being forwarded to said **destination VPN**, removing said **first forwarding tag** from said data packet, and forwarding said packet to **the destination address, identified in the second tag.**

No new matter is added, see page 10 lines 28 to page 11 line 4. In this section the first tag based on the egress router maps the next hop, and the second tag specifies the channel that links the egress edge router to the destination in the VPN.

Applicant's attorney has tried to carefully follow the terminology of the existing claims, but if inconsistencies persist due to my misunderstanding of some terms, I would

appreciate if the Examiner might call me at my direct number below to discuss correcting the terminology.

An advantage of two tags is to avoid having general forwarding information stored in a transit router, when the packet is meant for another location within the same VPN. See page 7, lines 7 to 23. The transit routers only need the information for the next hop and not any information regarding the final addressed host. The edge provider router interprets the second tag to indicate the router in that accesses the addressed host in the proper VPN.


Husak discloses a system for determining a more direct connection between devices in different VLAN's that are both part of a local area network, LAN. Husak forms a VLAN tag, asks for and receives connectivity information, and then sends the packets so tagged to the receiving devices through a more direct route determined from the connectivity information. However, since the forwarding addresses must be maintained within the routers there is no savings of memory, for the many VLAN's that may be formed within a single service provider must still exist along with the connectivity information to the world outside the service provider. Husak might determine a more efficient path but does not reduce the forwarding addressing, memory, etc. needed to implement his invention.

That is, in Husak, the packet may be destined for any distant address via the Internet, so the entire forwarding table to the next hop routers must be held. The present invention provides for a two tag system where, where packets meant for addresses within the same VLAN, the entire forwarding table need not be stored.

All the present claims distinguish the cited prior art and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Edwin H. Paul", is written over a horizontal line.

Edwin H. Paul  
Reg. No. 31,405  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210-2414  
(617) 951-3040